REMARKS

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

> **Applicants election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on July 22, 2005 is acknowledged. Upon reconsideration the examiner has decided to rejoin all claims pending in the present application.**

The applicant acknowledges the examiner's rejoining of the claims.

> **Specification**
>
> **The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Paragraph 5, there should be a period and a space between "lightThe".**
>
> **Appropriate correction is required.**

Paragraph 5 of the specification has been amended.

> **Claim Objections**
>
> **Claims 34 and 36 are objected to because of the following informalities:**
>
> **In claim 34 the examiner believes "a assembly" should be "an assembly". In claim 36 "surfaceassembly" should be two words.**
>
> **Appropriate correction is required.**

Claims 34 and 36 have been amended.

> **Claims 1-5, 8-12, 18 and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oguchi (U.S. Pat. No. 5,691,844). Oguchi teaches an assembly to use in a screen comprising a metal reflective surface (Al) and a layer (SiO and/or MgF_2) to reduce an amount of difference in reflectivity of the metal reflective surface for incident light polarized in two directions (abstract). As can be seen in figure 7, the layer is made of Silicon Oxide and is between 60-75 nm or between 50-200 nm and the metal surface is less than 200nm.**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a "matte metal reflective surface." Oguchi's "reflection mirror" is not a screen at all, but is used "for reflecting ... light emitted from a

projection source ... toward a screen." (claim 1) Oguchi says nothing about whether the metal film layer of the mirror is matte. Oguchi does not describe and would not have made obvious an assembly comprising "a matte metal reflective surface." Claim 34 has been amended and is patentable for at least similar reasons as claim 1. The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reason as the claims on which they depend.

> Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically claim 38 is indefinite because it recites desired properties of a screen rather than structure that will provide the desired properties. It does not appear to be a means/step plus function claim but in the instance the applicant meant claim 38 to be a means/step plus function claim, it is not a proper means plus function step plus function claim as set forth in MPEP 2181.
> ***
> Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Martinez (U.S. Pat. No. 4,025,160). It is noted that the only positive method step recited is the step of projecting an image. The desire of what to project the image on is an intended use. Yamashita teaches in figure 3 that it was known to project an image. Figure 3 also depicts a viewing angle of at least ±32 degrees (±55 degrees). The projected light is not polarized (it is already randomly polarized/unpolarized). The reflected light will reflect back randomly polarized/unpolarized which will result in a depolarization amount of 0 which is less than 1%.

Claim 38 has been amended to recite that what is being depolarized is light that had been polarized. Contrary to the examiner's assertion that the projected light in Martinez is not polarized, Martinez says nothing about whether the light is polarized or not, nor whether the reflected light is depolarized. Martinez does not describe and would not have made obvious "depolarizing incident polarized light by less than 1%."

> Claims 6-7 and 36 ...
>
> Claims 19-20 and 37 ...

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

> Allowable Subject Matter

```
Claims 13-17 are objected to as being dependent upon
a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if
rewritten in independent form including all of the
limitations of the base claim and any intervening
claims.

Claims 39-40 would be allowable if rewritten to
overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112,2nd
paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to
include all of the limitations of the base claim and
any intervening claims.

Claims 21-31 are allowed.
```

The applicant acknowledges the patentability of claims 13 – 17, 31 – 31, and 39 – 40. Claims 13, 39, and 40 have been amended.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Enclosed is a $120 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, reference 02103-589001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/2/6

David L. Feigenbaum
Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906
21234194.doc